UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,975	01/22/2004	Brian J. Cox	388700-058B	7891
	7590 06/10/200 ELLECTUAL PROPE	EXAMINER		
2281 W. 190TH		SEVERSON, RYAN J		
SUITE 200 TORRANCE, O	CA 90504		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			3731	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/763,975	COX, BRIAN J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ryan Severson	3731		

	Ryan Severson	3731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviteal (with appeal fee) in compliance w	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially rec	idoling of Simplifying ti	10 133003 101
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.194. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	maliant Amandment (OTOL 224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		npliant Amendment (r	-10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	oplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>23-28,40 and 41</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>29-39,42 and 43</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	hofore or on the date of filing a No	tice of Annaal will not	he entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731			
Caportiony i atom Examinor, fit offic of or			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The addition of new claims 44 and 45 require further consideration. Further, the new claims are presented without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the combination proposed in the final action is improper for multiple reasons. Applicant first asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Silvestrini for an expanding material as a replacement material for the reactive material of Deem. However, the combination is made to show that both materials are suitable for performing the intended purpose (blocking flow of blood into the aneurysm) and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that more than one type of material may be used to perform the same function. Applicant further discloses using the material of Silvestrini in the cover of Deem would defeat the purpose of Deem because the cover would then "likely" swell and occlude the vessel as well as the opening to the aneurysm. However, applicant provides no factual support for this assertion. Certainly the swellable material of Silvestrini does not occlude the healthy vessel, and so an argument asserting using the same material in the same way on a differently structured support structure would occlude a healthy vessel is by nature not persuasive. Finally, applicant argues Silvestrini and Deem teach away from one another because Deem is directed to restricting flow into an aneurysm and Silvestrini is directed to increasing flow in the blood vessel. Both Silvestrini and Deem maintain sufficient blood flow through the healthy blood vessel, and therefore the argument that they teach away from eachother based on two different aspects of the inventions is not persuasive. The argument could only be persuasive if one of the two references taught occluding the healthy vessel. However, since neither have this desirability, the argument is not persuasive. The rejection as set forth in the final rejection is maintained.